

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

---

## Editorial

Thomas, Suzie

2014

---

Thomas , S , McDavid , C & Gutteridge , A 2014 , ' Editorial ' , Journal of Community  
Archaeology and Heritage , vol. 1 , no. 1 , pp. 1-4 . <https://doi.org/10.1179/2051819613Z.0000000009>

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/301513>

<https://doi.org/10.1179/2051819613Z.0000000009>

---

acceptedVersion

---

*Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.*

*This is an electronic reprint of the original article.*

*This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.*

*Please cite the original version.*

Suzie Thomas, Carol McDavid & Adam Gutteridge (2014) Editorial, *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 1:1, 1-4, DOI: 10.1179/2051819613Z.0000000009

Welcome to the first issue of the *Journal of Community Archaeology and Heritage*. When we first discussed this new journal with Maney Publishing, the first question to address was, obviously — why start a new journal at all? Are community archaeology and community heritage of sufficient interest and breadth to warrant a separate publication? Is ‘community’ practice different from other forms of ‘public’ work? There are other very good journals, including some of our Maney siblings, which deal with the intersections between archaeology and heritage as professional disciplines and ‘the public’. Although initial response to our journal has been extremely positive, and would seem to show that there is indeed a useful niche for this effort, it will be a continuing challenge to be something distinct. This first issue represents an early but by no means fully realized effort to do this.

In this Foreword to Issue 1, we will touch on some ways in which we hope to be different, introducing the specific papers included here, but realizing that we may wind up with something completely different over time, as different audiences respond and contribute. That is, we see all community archaeology and heritage projects as, in effect, conversations — and this particular journal is, when conceived broadly, one such project. Therefore, the true ‘creators’ of this journal will be our audiences, engaged in a conversation from which new ideas and even more conversations will emerge.

First, as noted on our web page, we hope that, over time, our contributors and audiences will include participants, volunteers, practitioners, and professionals (academic and otherwise). We hope they will use these pages to discuss any and all arenas for community engagement, including but not limited to excavation, management, stewardship, evaluation, interpretation and presentation, as well as other forms of collaboration, outreach, and participation. The underlying theme is, of course, ‘community’, but there are countless ways to define that idea. Therefore, we fully expect — hope for — some surprises. Our goal is for these pages to provide a platform for analysis, case study, productive critique, and even inspiration, and that those usually referred to as stakeholders, communities, avocationalists, or volunteers will be happy to join the conversation. At the same time, we welcome academic and professional voices from the various disciplinary discourses that surround the issues of community engagement and empowerment. We want to provide a place where ‘academic’ and other voices participate on the same playing field — speaking to and with, not past or down to, each other.

It will, therefore, be noticeable that, in this first issue, the full-length papers are largely the outputs of academic authors. On one hand, this is to be celebrated because it demonstrates the scope of scholarly interest in this fascinating facet of archaeological theory and practice. On the other hand, we hope in future to receive more varied contributions from stakeholders and other types of participants listed above. One of our challenges, as Editors, will be to encourage these abundant but sometimes hard-to-find (and recruit) voices to share their findings, views, and experiences in this conversation — so outreach and awareness-raising will continue to be editorial priorities. As an even more concrete strategy, we are also piloting a partnering system in which Editorial Board members and others, on a voluntary basis, work with prospective contributors to refine drafts, advise on relevant literature, and assist with language or other issues. That is, when we see a contribution that has merit, but which needs more hands-on editorial collaboration, we will find a way to make that collaboration happen. This is very much a new approach, and there are a number of papers in the planning stages now that will benefit from it (and we thank the colleagues who have already provided us with significant support in this area for this current issue).

As a second distinction, we hope to provide a space for multivocal conversation about the more difficult aspects of community archaeology and heritage, even as we provide a showcase for good community archaeology projects. That is, providing a public relations forum solely to celebrate ‘good work’ is not our goal — we want our contributors to share their problems and challenges as well as their successes and

achievements. To this end we have asked our authors, from whatever field or type of participation, to go beyond simple descriptions of 'what happened' on this or that project to comment on its larger implications, in whatever context they wish (archaeology and heritage, the needs of a given community, or larger society) or, even, simply to share what did not work, even as they share what did.

Although we are not surprised that achieving this degree of self-criticality and reflexivity has been a challenge, we are satisfied that the papers in this inaugural issue make a good start. For example, De Nardi, taking us to Italy, has situated her community engagement work with reference to technological discourses, not 'community archaeology' per se, and has noted several examples of the challenges she faced while doing this. Her project — which found ways for a local community to contribute to collaborative experiential maps — is similar in some respects to the project that Karl et al. are planning, which is to invite local communities to contribute to the photographic archives of an area. Although this paper is somewhat more provisional, in that it describes a project that has yet to be completed, in both projects local people are able to engage head-on with the local historic environment and its often personal meanings, as it relates to them.

The Karl et al. paper is also an example of the third distinction — we do not insist that all papers fall into traditional academic categories (such as case study, analysis, theorization, commentary, editorial, etc.). We are happy to accept papers which lay out potential research, or which are otherwise provisional and experimental. Again, we see this journal as the crux of an ongoing wider conversation that surrounds and emerges from many forms of community engagement. Hence we are not concerned with strict categories or formal definitions — although our job as editors will be to see that even experimental or provisional ideas are presented clearly. We are most interested in the free flowing exchange of ideas.

That said, as noted above, we certainly do not reject scholarly voices, nor do we object to contributions from those who situate themselves within established discourses and disciplinary territories. One paper which does this is from Schmidt, a senior scholar who has laboured in the field of ethnoarchaeology for decades. This is a field which recent writing tends to situate as 'archaeological ethnography' or (as we do here) 'community archaeology'. Here Schmidt makes a point with which we agree — that many traditional scholars have done 'community archaeology' in the past, without its being identified as such. What is framed as community archaeology in the twenty-first century would, arguably, not exist without early ethnoarchaeology, early public archaeology, early applied anthropology, or for that matter, early interpretive anthropology and archaeology. The key differences and distinct disciplinary trajectories we identify now are, for the most part, a matter of building on the past rather than creating something entirely new (and we would invite some future contribution, or contributions, to lay out these trajectories in more detail). So, Schmidt offers a longitudinal view of contemporary community archaeology that situates it in the context of the work which anticipated it, and his demonstration of this within the African context is particularly instructive.

Similarly, Greer draws on a wealth of experience of community archaeology and community collaboration, both from her own personal experiences and more broadly within the context of Australian archaeology. Like Schmidt's paper, hers demonstrates the long history of community engagement in a specific geographic area, and the influence that this has had on the discipline. Another paper, van den Dries, also takes an academic approach to examining what happens (or does not happen) in a setting where there is far less of a tradition, or at least a continual tradition, of public and community archaeology. She illustrates this clearly in her overview paper of the situation as it currently stands in the Netherlands.

The fourth distinction, made in support of the first three, is that we have made a deliberate decision to welcome non-standard narrative forms and somewhat more informal writing than is the case in many professional journals. Even in this first issue, this presented a learning curve, for our contributors as well as our reviewers, both of whom are sometimes uncomfortable with (for example) the use of the first person

in an academic journal. Allowing a more open style of writing has also created challenges for us, as editors, in that by 'informal', we do not mean that we will accept poorly thought-out or unsupported claims. Our goal will be to maintain substance and intellectual rigour even while accepting — indeed, seeking — texts which are written in less traditional ways. We are also aware that to some degree this means re-defining what 'rigour' really means — again, we reject traditional categories in favour of a situated but, insofar as is possible, open conversation. Although this issue offers for the most part fairly traditional academic writing, here too we hope the mix develops over time.

Beyond the longer papers described above, Issue 1 also includes the first of our continual series of 'Reflections' papers. These are shorter articles in which diverse individuals (often but not always from within the voluntary sector) are able to share somewhat more personal experiences of archaeology and heritage. Why did they become involved? What impact has this had on them and their outlooks?

Netherlands-based Jobbe Wijnen, who has found himself making the transition from hobbyist metal-detector user to paid archaeologist, and who is driven by a passion for the archaeology of the Second World War and the archaeology of buildings in particular, shares his story in this issue. As the issues progress, we hope that these different narratives from across the globe will encourage those who may not typically publish in academic journals to have a voice. Over the longer term we, perhaps ambitiously, envisage the Reflections series becoming a fascinating archive of personal accounts from the participants within archaeology and heritage activities.

Finally, we have also asked those who review events, books, and conferences to do so with an eye to whether any given event or book addresses the interests of this particular journal. Often this has involved asking people to step outside comfort zones, to ask for slightly different forms of critique, or to comment specifically on issues that we think the readers of this journal will want to know about. We hope that this dimension of our review process will come forward even more in future issues, and JCAH's Assistant Editors Lorna Richardson and John Jameson (who are responsible for reviews) are to be thanked hugely for their hard work in getting this section of the journal up and running (they have also provided an extremely helpful extra set of eyes on some of the longer papers).

In addition to reviews of books and conferences (and in this issue you will read about Archaeology, Narrative, and the Politics of the Past: The View from Southern Maryland, a book by Julia A. King, and the International Heritage Interpretation Conference, which was held in Sigtuna, Sweden, earlier in the year), we also want to hear about community-based events. These can be anything from community-created exhibitions to open days, field training schools and special events put on by volunteers and others for the wider public. It could equally be websites and online toolkits developed by and/or for voluntary sector participants. By welcoming reviews of a wider variety of events and outputs than is usually expected in academic journals, and by welcoming non-academic authors to contribute both reviews as well as papers, we can (and should) go a step further than many other journals do while remaining also a discussion platform for professionals interested in community engagement.

In addition to the journal itself, we also run a blog (<http://journalcah.blogspot.co.uk>), and have a social media presence through Facebook and Twitter (@CommunityArchae). Through the blog we plan to provide regular updates, from ourselves and from guest bloggers, on all sorts of topics and discussions, even reviews, connected to our core interests. We also hope that over time other people will engage with these online platforms, through blog posts, by responding in comments to the blog entries, and by participating in the social media outlets. In conclusion, we are trying to do something quite new here, while also fitting into the wider academic debates. We hope that our readers will tell us, through the different channels we provide, the answers to some key questions — what do you want to see? What do you want to read about? And how do you want to engage? We look forward to hearing from you!